

Remarks

Claims 2-30 and 32-42 are pending in the application, of which claims 32 and 37 are rejected. By this paper, applicant has amended claims 3, 11, 18 and 37 and added claims 43-57. Claims 11 and 18 are amended to correct typographical errors.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 32 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bartos et al. (US 6,408,869 B1).

Claim 32 depends from claim 37 and therefore is patentable for at least the reasons stated below with reference to claim 37.

Claim 37 requires “a main valve member disposed *upstream* of the valve seat.” In contrast, the main valve member of Bartos et al. (elements 3 and 10) is disposed *downstream* of the valve seat (Bartos et al. 28). Therefore claim 37 does not read on Bartos et al. and is not anticipated thereby.

Further, claim 37 requires “an *upstream* side of the main valve member is exposed to fluid in the secondary fluid passageway.” The upstream side of the Bartos et al. main valve member (3, 10) is not exposed to the secondary fluid passageway (34, 36, 38, 39). In contrast, the *downstream* side of the main valve member of Bartos et al. (3, 10) is exposed to fluid in the secondary fluid passageway (34, 36, 38, 39). Therefore claim 37 does not read on Bartos et al. and is not anticipated thereby.

Even further, claim 37 requires “a pressure differential forcing [the main valve member] in the direction of flow in the secondary fluid passageway.” In contrast, the pressure differential of Bartos et al. forces the main valve member (3, 10) in the *opposite* direction of

flow in the secondary fluid passageway (34, 36, 38, 39). Therefore claim 37 does not read on Bartos et al. and is not anticipated thereby.

Since claim 37 is not anticipated by Bartos, et al., applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 32 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 2-30, 33-36 and 38-42 are allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Yet Chan

By 

Michael D. Turner
Reg. No. 52,306
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: 1/6/05

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351